

## REMARKS

The Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Examiner's Office Action dated September 29, 2008. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following comments.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 10 are amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the claimed invention without adding any new matter. Accordingly, claims 1, 3, 5-6 and 9-15 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1, 3, 5-6 and 9-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for the reasons spanning pages 2-3 of the Action. In particular, claim 1 is amended to clarify that the short circuit line is half the electrical length of the first radiator as shown in Figures 4-5 of the present application. With respect to the objection and rejections to claim 10, the foregoing amendments clarify the same. The recitation of "total length" in claim 10 refers to a physical length. It is believed that claims 1, 3, 5-6 and 9-15 are fully definite under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0006937 to Sekine et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Sekine"). This rejection is traversed.

Sekine fails to teach "a short circuit pin for grounding the antenna; and a short circuit line for releasing the supplied signals partially, the short circuit line being positioned between the short circuit pin and the feed point, and the short circuit line having a length which is half of the first radiator's electrical length, wherein the feed point is positioned in substantially center of electrical length of the first radiator and the

electric waves are released omni-directionally”, as required in independent claim 1 of the present application.

The Examiner asserts that reference numeral 28 of Sekine corresponds to the recited feed point of the claimed invention. However, referring to Fig. 17 and paragraph [0081] of Sekine, *21 denotes the feed point, 28 depicts a node, and 22, 24, 25 and 52 are wire antenna elements*. Referring to paragraph [0012] and [0013] of Sekine, one end of the first linear antenna element is connected to the feed point, one end of the second linear antenna element is connected to the other end of the first linear antenna element, one end of the third linear antenna element is connected to the other end of the first linear antenna element, one end of the fourth linear antenna element is connected to the other end of the second linear antenna element. As mentioned above, the feed point of Sekine is connected to one end of the first linear antenna element; however, the feed point of the claimed invention is positioned in substantially center of electrical length of the first radiator and the electric waves are released omni-directionally. Accordingly, Sekine is entirely different from the present invention because its feed point cannot be “positioned in substantially center of the electrical length of the first radiator”, as required by independent claim 1 of the present application. Consequently, Sekine cannot anticipate claims 1 and 3 because it fails to disclose all of the recited features of the claimed invention. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekine in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,936,587 to Gudilev et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Gudilev”); claims 6, 9-12 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekine in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No.

2006/0017624 to Nagano et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Nagano”) And, claims 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekine in view of Nagano and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,466,176 to Moaz et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Moaz”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and the Examiner’s assertions.

As mentioned above, Sekine fails to teach, disclose or even suggest the following required element: “the feed point is positioned in substantially center of electrical length of the first radiator and the electric waves are released omni-directionally.” Gudilev is applied for its teaching of a meander line structure. While Gudilev discloses a feed point 26, there is no disclosure of a short circuit line having a length which is half of a first radiator’s length. Nagano does not even use the word “feed point” in its disclosure and thus, cannot teach or suggest the required element mentioned above. Finally, Moaz was applied for its teachings of a flexible printed circuit board and while a single feed point is discussed with reference to elements 104 and 104’ of Figure 18 of Moaz, there is no disclosure of a short line circuit line having a length which is half of a first radiator’s length as required by the claimed invention. Consequently, even if Sekine is combined with any of references cited by Examiner, the claimed invention would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. It is submitted that it is only through a hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention using the applicants’ disclosure as a template that the Examiner could make the assertions in the Office Action. Such a hindsight reconstruction is not permitted under the U.S. patent laws. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 5, 6, and 9-15 are not obvious, and request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

For the above stated reasons, it is submitted that the claimed invention is technologically different from the applied prior art and that all of the claims are allowable over the prior art of record. Applicants have fully responded to each matter of substance raised in the Office Action and believe that the case is in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this application be passed to issuance with claims 1, 3, 5-6, and 9-15 being indicated as allowed over the prior art of record.

It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Director is authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 22-0261, under Order No. 31656-226487.

Should the Examiner believe that a conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 29, 2008

/Catherine M. Voorhees/

Catherine M. Voorhees  
Registration No. 33,074  
VENABLE LLP  
P.O. Box 34385  
Washington, DC 20043-9998  
Telephone: (202) 962-4800  
Telefax: (202) 962-8300

CMV  
::ODMA\PCDOCS\DC2DOCS\1\1005840\